REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Action mailed February 15, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 8 has been amended to address matters raised by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8-13 are in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cajolet. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 1 recites ". . . providing one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering of the first or second frames the first and second servers." By contrast, as shown in col. 10, lines 34-37, of the Cajolet patent, the assisting computer completes its portion of the task and then returns its results to the problem dispatcher. There is no disclosure in the Cajolet patent that its assisting computer provides samples of rendered frames prior to completing its portion of the render job as required by the claimed invention. Thus, the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering the first or second frames by the first and second servers as required by the claimed invention.

Independent Claim 8 recites ". . . the schedule server operable to provide one or more samples of the rendered first frame received from the first one of the plurality of render servers for the render job to the client prior to completion

of rendering the first frame by the first one of the plurality of render servers." By contrast, as shown in col. 10, lines 34-37, of the Cajolet patent, the assisting computer completes its portion of the task and then returns its results to the problem dispatcher. There is no disclosure in the Cajolet patent that its assisting computer provides samples of rendered frames prior to completing its portion of the render job as required by the claimed invention. Thus, the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide one or more samples of the rendered first frame received from the first one of the plurality of render servers for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering of the first frame by the first one of the plurality of render servers as required by the claimed invention.

Independent Claim 14 recites ". . . wherein the remote rendering system is operable to provide one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the local rendering system prior to completion of rendering the first or second frames by the remote rendering system." By contrast, as shown in col. 10, lines 34-37, of the Cajolet patent, the assisting computer completes its portion of the task and then returns its results to the problem dispatcher. There is no disclosure in the Cajolet patent that its assisting computer provides samples of rendered frames prior to completing its portion of the render job as required by the claimed invention. Thus, the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide the local rendering system with samples of rendered first or second frames prior to completion of rendering of the first or second frames the remote rendering system as provided in the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-29 are not anticipated by the Cajolet patent.

Independent Claim 21 recites ". . . providing one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering of the first or second frames by the first and second remote servers." By contrast, as shown in col. 10, lines 34-37, of the Cajolet patent, the assisting computer completes its portion of the task and then returns its results to the problem dispatcher. There is no disclosure in the Cajolet patent that its assisting computer provides samples of rendered frames prior to completing its portion of the render job as required by the claimed invention. Thus, the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering the first or second frames by the first and second remote servers as required by the claimed invention.

As shown above, each of the independent claims provide features not disclosed in the Cajolet patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-29 are not anticipated by the Cajolet patent.

This Response to Examiner's Final Action is necessary the address the Examiner's characterization of the cited art in support of the rejections to the claims. This Response to Examiner's Final Action could not have been presented earlier as the Examiner has only now provided the current characterization of the cited art in support of the claim rejections.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   PATENT APPLICATION
062986.0186   09/609,046
(901.00)

13

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments associated with this Application to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

April 17, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6447

Customer Number: 05073